Linda A. King State Bar # 087138
Law Offices of Linda A. King
2044 First Ave., Suite 200
San Diego, Ca 92101-2079
619) 233-8034 FAX (619) 233-4516

Attorney for Nuria Christina Ramirez

United States District Court

Southern District of California

United States of America, Plaintiff, vs. CARLOS SAAVEDRA, Defendant	Case No.: 08MJ8065 – 08CR302 **DECLARATION OF LINDA A. KING IN SUPPORT OF MATERIAL WITNESS MOTION FOR A VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION** **DATE: February 22, 2008** **TIME: 10:00 am** **HON.: Magistrate Judge Peter Lewis**

I the undersigned, declare as follows:

1. My name is Linda A. King, and I am the attorney of record for Nuria Christina Ramirez, the Material Witness in the above-captioned matter. I am a attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of California and am admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

2. On January 25, 2008 I was appointed to represent the Material Witness in the above-captioned matter. As a Material Witness attorney, one of my primary responsibilities is to help

arrange the release of the Material Witness from the custody of the U.S. Marshal and INS as soon as practicable. To that end, I immediately conducted an interview with the Material Witness to explain why she was being held and under what conditions she could be released. I informed the Material Witness that the most expedient way to be released is by having a personal surety post a court approved appearance bond. I explained that a personal surety would have to agree to sign a $5,000.00 appearance bond, post an immigration bond, and agree to allow the Material Witness to stay with the surety pending final disposition of the case. Unfortunately, Immigration will not allow the release of the witness, Nuria Christina Ramirez, because she is from El Salvador. A deposition is necessary to eliminate holding Ms. Ramirez in custody indefinitely.

3. I am not aware of any reason in this case why the Material Witness testimony can not be adequately secured by deposition. Likewise, I have not been informed of any such reasons by either the government or defense attorney.

4. The Material Witness is more than willing to discuss everything they know about this case with both defense and government investigators. The fact is, however, there are only a few facts relevant to this case which the Material Witness is competent to testify: i.e. (a) her citizenship, (b) who might have transported the witness, and (c) whether the witness agreed

to pay anyone. According to preliminary interviews, all of the facts relevant to this case in the Material Witness knowledge took place over a very short period of time.

5. I explained the general procedure for videotape deposition to the witness and explained that, if she was released after the deposition, she may have to return to testify at trial if subpoenaed by the government or defendant. The witness indicated she was willing to return if arrangements for her legal re-entry could be made and travel expenses provided.

6. The material witness petition the court to take her deposition and release her, as she speaks only Spanish . Her family is forced to suffer during her detention and she would like to return home.I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed in San Diego, California on February 7, 2008.

Dated this February 7, 2008

_s/ Linda A. King__
Linda A. King
Attorney for Material Witness